

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing is responsive to the February 7, 2008 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,189,056 (hereinafter Ogura), in view of Crawford et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,771,354 (hereinafter Crawford). The rejection asserts that Ogura allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for “emulating a user interface for the application on the host device, wherein the emulated user interface generally corresponds in appearance to the user interface on the communication device, and executing the application only on the communications device, wherein information to be displayed on the user interface of said communication device is redirected to the emulated interface,” which is allegedly taught by Crawford. Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35, 37-40, 42-45, 47-54 and 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura in view of Crawford and in further view of Abkowitz et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0041973 (hereinafter Abkowitz). The rejection asserts that Ogura and Crawford allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for “emulating a device display area in conjunction with the user interface”, which is allegedly taught by Abkowitz.

The present claims are directed toward emulating the user interface and display of a communication device executing an application, wherein the emulated user interface generally corresponds to the user interface on said communication device, wherein information to be displayed on the user interface of said communication device is redirected to the emulated

interface; and executing said application only on said communication device. For example,

Claim 1 includes the language:

loading the application on the communication device; emulating a user interface for said application on said host device, wherein the emulated user interface generally corresponds in appearance to the user interface on said communication device, wherein information to be displayed on the user interface of said communication device is redirected to the emulated interface; and executing said application only on said communication device.

Similar language is in all the independent claims. Thus, in the present claims, the communication device redirects any information that would normally be displayed on the communication device to the emulated interface, and the execution of said application occurs only on said communication device.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests redirecting any information to be displayed on the emulated interface while execution of the application occurs only on said communication device. Ogura fails to teach any emulated display. Crawford teaches an Internet ordering system which uses a replica computer 160 to assist. However, according to the teaching of Crawford, the replica computer 160 simply adds to the processing power of the host computer

104. Column 17, lines 1-25 of Crawford state (emphasis added):

On-line service system 100 also includes at least one (and typically many) "replica computer" 160. Replica computer 160 is connected to host computer 104 via communication controllers 112, and is also capable of connecting directly to customer computer 50 via a modem 162. Replica computer 160 is the same type of computer as is customer computer 50 and thus may be used to perform the same types of processing that customer computer 50 is capable of performing. This replica computer 160 **adds processing capabilities to host computer 104** (which may be a different type of computer not capable of executing the same software that customer computer 50 is capable of executing).

In the preferred embodiment, replica computer 160 is capable of operating in an on-line mode or in an off-line mode. In the on-line mode, the replica computer 160 communicates interactively with customer computer 50 to perform processing tasks. In this on-line mode in the preferred embodiment, **the customer computer 50 and the on-line replica computer 160 cooperate to support processing in either and/or both processors (shared access to data buffers and a record locking scheme is used to ensure safe access). In the off-line**

mode, replica computer 160 performs personal computer tasks in response to direction from host computer 104 without having an on-line, interactive link with customer computer 50.

Thus, the replica computer of Crawford is simply additional processing power to the customer computer. In Crawford, no matter how you define the computers, there is never execution of the application only on the communication device. Presumably, in Crawford the communications device would be the customer computer. If so, then the replica computer either performs some or all of the tasks. If the replica computer is viewed as the communications device, which is how the office action defines it, then the replica computer is always sharing processing with either the host computer and/or the customer computer. There is never a scenario where all the present claim limitations are taught by any combination of Crawford and Ogura. Abkowitz simply teaches a device simulator, and no actual program is running on a remote communication device, nor is any display information ever redirected to any emulated interface.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46.

Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1, 16, 31, and 46, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59 are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-20, 22-30, 32-35, 37-45, and 47-59.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated May 21, 2008

:

By: /James T. Hagler/

James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631
(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502